

CHAPTER X

Interventions on Education and Skill Training for Urban Working Children in Bangladesh: A Comparative Assessment of Different Bodies

The interventions of different bodies like the Government of Bangladesh, Non-Government Organizations, International Non-Government Organizations, United Nations Agencies, Donor Countries and Organizations, etc. have been assessed in the previous five chapters (Chapter V-IX). These different bodies follow different strategies, and techniques with their different institutional structures and capacities to fight against the child labour problem in Bangladesh. Their approach and outlook on the problem, nature and forms of intervention and service areas are also different. At the same time, there are some common factors in their interventions. In many interventions, specially in education and skill training, there is a strong interdependency, networking and collaborating relationship among these bodies.

10.1. Policy and Goals, Approach, Outlook and Strategy

10.1.1. The Policy and Goals to Combat Child Labour:

There was no mentionable GOB initiative before 1994 to develop a direct policy to combat the child labour problem. In December 1994, the GOB adopted a National Children Policy (NCP)¹ and under the section 'children in difficult circumstances', only Articles 4 and 5 cover the child labour issue and the child labourers (GOB, 1994a). Under the provision of NCP, however, a National Children Council (NCC) was established for the first time in the mid-1990s which the highest policy is making body on children's welfare. The GOB also adopted the first National Plan of Action (NPA) on children during the early 1990s under the 'Fourth Five-Year Plan 1990-95' to achieve UN CRC goals on children. The second 'NPA for Children 1992-2002' was also designed to ensure CRC goals by developing needful services.

¹ Child-related policy and plans of the GOB have been discussed in Chapter III (under Section 3.6).

These policies and plans, however, were not very specified and specialized for the combat of child labour. With the cooperation and collaboration of the ILO-IPEC, in 1997, the GOB formulated an NPA against child labour with its six broad areas:

- a) Situation analysis for better understanding of the problem;
- b) Child labour policy, legislation and enforcement;
- c) Institutional development (Govt., NGOs, employers and trade unions);
- d) Social security and rehabilitation of the working children;
- e) Prevention of child labour through formal education, non-formal education and pre-vocational/vocational training; and
- f) Awareness rising against the problem (Rahman, M.A. 1998: 70-71).

Child labourers are also covered by the education policy and planning of the GOB. Under the NCP-1994, and during the Fourth Five-Year Plan (1990-95), the provision of education for urban working children came to the light in the GOB's policy for the first time.² The other progress was the creation of a separate directorate, i.e., DNFE and a separate division (PMED) in 1995. The last one is the most important government organization to plan and create opportunities for non-formal basic education for rural and urban working children.

On the other hand, UN agencies like UNICEF and ILO-IPEC, worked closely with the GOB departments and ministries to adopt all those child-related national policy and plans for the working children group. For example, ILO-IPEC helped the government to formulate the NPA against child labour in 1997. Big NGOs and other national and international communities also helped the GOB to develop the child-centered policy and plans by providing their experience, suggestions and other strategic points of views.

10.1.2. Approach, Outlook and Strategy of Child Labour Intervention:

Combat against child labour is a combined effort of different bodies, but each of them may have a different approach of work, outlook and working strategy. In case of Bangladesh, it is a reality. There are some differences as well as similarities in the approach, outlook and strategies of different bodies on this issue.

² The education policies and plans of the GOB covering working children have been discussed in Chapter V (Section 5.1).

i) The Government: As the leader of the nation, usually the Government is the most important body to take the major responsibility. Ideally, according to ILO, “three fundamental types of action against child labour can be provided only by the central government: (i) child labour legislation and appropriate enforcement mechanisms; (ii) a national child labour policy that sets public properties and reaches out to engage all the important social actors; and (iii) a publicly funded system of basic education that ensures quality schooling that is physically and economically accessible to children of even the very poorest families” (ILO, 1996: 18). From ILO experience, again, “it has become clear that no single action against child labour can have a significant impact unless it is anchored in a national plan. Deriving and implementing such a plan is the primary responsibility of governments” (ILO, 1996: 15).

On its part, the GOB has taken necessary initiatives, mainly in the 1990s. As per the ILO standard, the GOB has enacted laws for children’s welfare but covered child labourer inadequately. The ‘Children Act 1974’ and the ‘Bangladesh Shishu Academy Ordinance 1976’ are the two related laws that touch working children groups through indirect and inadequate ways. The GOB adopted the ‘National Children’s Policy’ in 1994 and created the ‘Ministry of Women’s and Children’s Affairs’ in the same year. The GOB also prepared the ‘National Plan of Action for Children’ in the mid-1990s. All of these focussed on the child or the child labour problem – not in details but partly.³

The GOB, however, approached to combat the child labour problem mainly through formal and non-formal basic education – with this understanding that – education is one of the key strategies to combat the problem. In 1990 the ‘Primary Education (Compulsory) Act’ was passed to ensure free and compulsory primary education for all 6-10 years old children of the country. These initiatives were directed, at least partly, to the underprivileged working children’s education. From the NGO experience and support of the UNICEF and donors, the GOB emphasised on non-formal basic education in the late 1990s as the successful strategy for the fight against child labour. Through this process, the GOB

³ These laws and plans are discussed briefly in Chapter III under Sections 35.2, 3.5.3 and 3.6.

undertook the largest NFE programme for the 8-14 years aged urban working children in 6 divisional cities named 'Basic Education for Hard-to-Reach Urban Children' (BEHTRUC) Project.⁴

During the mid-1990s, for example, the GOB took initiatives to collect nation-wide data regarding child labour, which is very essential to develop action plans to combat the problem. On the basis of those data the GOB adopted the following strategies:

- a) Situation analysis/assessment through research and study,
- b) Taking special policies and plans,
- c) Creating legal provisions,
- d) Emphasizing on compulsory primary education,
- e) Creating non-formal education facilities for urban working children through DNFE,
- f) Creating shelter, medicare, sanitation, skill training and other facilities by CEDC and ARISE programmes through the Ministry of Social Welfare,
- g) Awareness raising programmes, and
- h) Supporting different NGO activities to combat the problem.

ii) The UN Agencies: The UN agencies, like the UNICEF and the ILO, approached child labour problem in Bangladesh with the following major strategies:

- (a) Research and study to analyze the magnitude and consequences of the problem throughout the country;
- (b) Advocacy and technical cooperation to the Government to develop appropriate policy, legal provisions and need-based programme planning to combat the problem successfully;
- (c) Institutional development, capacity building, and support services to the Government departments, NGOs, business organizations and others to combat child labour;
- (d) Provide special type of non-formal basic education, skill training, safety training, self-employment, and other direct facilities to the working children through the GOB departments, partner NGOs, and other local-level organizations;
- (e) Withdrawal of children from hazardous work with education, financial assistance and other alternatives;
- (f) Awareness raising and social mobilization activities;
- (g) Economic empowerment and support services to the relevant families to reduce the inflow of young children to work;

⁴ Education for urban working children as the GOB initiatives has been discussed in detail in Chapter V (under Section 5.2).

- (h) Wide-level networking and cooperation with other organizations e.g. Government departments, UN bodies, NGOs, INGOs, donors, trade unions, business organizations, etc.

iii) Non-Government Organizations: Most initiatives against child labour today come from the NGOs. It is the NGOs, who are closer to the urban poor and the underprivileged working children – because they are well-placed to the document area, and they know the special needs of those children. They generally enjoy the trust of the local committees and they can plan realistic local-level action programmes. This creates the best opportunity for the NGOs to take the ‘right approach’ and ‘proper outlook’ to fight against the child labour problem.⁵

The NGOs have some positive aspects as they are the grassroots organizations and direct service providers to the people. As ILO observed, generally the NGOs are good at deriving and implementing action programmes on behalf of working children, specially those who are already in the labour market (ILO, 1996: 20). It was only the NGOs that started intervening for the urban working children in the early 1970s in Bangladesh (e.g. the UCEP in 1973), and thus they were able to develop gradually their own outlook, approach, and strategy to combat the problem. The NGOs innovated special types of services as well as strategies such as: non-formal education, marketable skill training, job placement and self-employment, withdrawing from hazardous work with provision for alternatives, etc. with the cooperation and assistance of donors, INGOs, UN bodies, GOB departments and others. The major strategies followed by different NGOs to combat child labour were as follows:

- (a) Awareness raising and creating social alliance;
- (b) Special type of non-formal basic education;
- (c) Vocational/pre-vocational/technical skills training;
- (d) Job placement or self-employment support;
- (e) Economic or other types of assistance to the related families to reduce supply of working children and help them to access the schools;
- (f) Healthcare, recreation, shelter, personal hygiene, and other support services specially for the street and floating working children;

⁵ The NGOs’ interventions for urban working children in Bangladesh have been discussed and assessed in Chapter VI.

- (g) Withdrawing of children from hazardous work with multiple alternatives;
- (h) Safety training and equipment distribution to the hazardous child labourer;
- (i) Advocacy service and legal support for special child workers e.g. sex-workers;
- (j) Linkage with employers, family, community leaders, and others to make sure of their cooperation;
- (k) Social mobilization, community involvement, linkage and partnership development with other organizations;
- (l) Manpower development with necessary training; etc.

Some of the leading NGOs developed a well-coordinated and integrated multidimensional approach through implementing many of these strategies simultaneously – and these NGOs are found to be more successful in combating the problem e.g. UCEP– which is discussed in Chapters VIII & IX).

iv) The INGOs and Donors: The INGOs and donors are also playing important roles to fight against child labour – though they are working mainly through an indirect approach, because they do not have grassroot level action programmes. The major working strategies followed by them are:

- (a) Providing funds to the NGOs, the GOB departments and others to run different action programmes to fight against the child labour problem;
- (b) Evaluation of different programme interventions related to child labour situation assessment and impact assessment of different child labour groups and provision of advice and suggestions for the appropriate strategy to combat the problem;
- (c) Advocacy for the children and strategic partnership with the GOB departments to take necessary national policies, planning and strategy for this purpose;
- (d) Collaboration, cooperation and networking with the GOB, UN bodies, leading NGOs, INGOs and donors to fight against the problem coordinately and successfully through a sustainable service.

10.2. Organization, Capacity Building, Supervision and Monitoring, Research and Evaluation

10.2.1. Organizational Structure:

Only a few NGOs and among UN bodies, the ILO-IPEC have their own special type of organizational structure which is specially helpful for providing services to the working children. Though the GOB has its strong bureaucracy,

different ministries (e.g. MOWCA, MOSW), Divisions (e.g. PMED), Directorates (e.g. DNFE) etc. – there is no special organizational set-up of the GOB to fight against child labour with a complete and multi-disciplinary approach. In the current organizational set-up, elimination of child labour is only a part of its objectives. The process of decision-making and implementation is very complex and time-consuming in practice. In most cases, the GOB follows the top-to-bottom decision-making system with its traditional organizational set-up.

Weaker manpower provisions and organizational structure are also involved in the largest GOB programme for urban working children, i.e., in the HTR Project. The DNFE is the executing agency of this project and it has a “skeleton structure”. The Formative Evaluation team on this project noticed that, “the only professional to assist the Project Director is an Assistant Director with no previous experience or training in non-formal education, placed on deputation from the BCS (Education) Cadre. The supporting staff in the Project Director’s office is also inadequate. With one programme officer and one office assistant for each divisional city, it is not at all possible to ensure effective delivery of the services including monitoring, supervision, and evaluation. ...The conclusion is irresistible that with the present management staff functioning under the present operating system, it is unlikely that the project (**HTR**) will be able to achieve its targets and objectives, as planned” (DNFE & UNICEF-Bangladesh, 2000a: 7 -1).

ARISE, the other project on street children, also faced these organizational and manpower problems. The Mid-Term Evaluation Report on **ARISE** observed that “...the basic leadership responsibility remains with the National Project Director(NPD). Given the fact that the project is spread over a very big part of the country it is difficult to centrally manage such an innovative project by the NPD alone considering that he is working only on a part-time basis for the project. As recorded by the evaluation team the NPD only comes in at the later half of the day.⁶ This is creating some confusion in the project coordination and hence is impeding the process” (DSS, 2001a: 16).

⁶ At around two in the afternoon.

The **UN bodies**, on the other hand, are working in Bangladesh as part of an international organizational system with their country offices. Though usually they follow their central organizational policies, they have the provisions for country-level and need-based planning and develop programmes based on both their own central policy and the respective national policy.

The **NGOs** are different in this respect. Most of them have their own comparatively simple organizational system with several branch offices, limited personnel, strong coordination, supervision and monitoring. Many of them take the matter as part of their broader developmental activities but some specially develop their organizational set-up with the central objective of fighting against child labour (e.g. AB, UCEP, Shoishob, etc.). Many of them follow both top-to-bottom and bottom-to-top decision making processes. They are the most popular organizations among the target people and have direct contact with them. The NGOs which are working for children have their apex body i.e., BSAF to coordinate their services.

The **INGOs and Donors**, on the other hand, are working without the GOB departments, NGOs and others. They are working mainly by an indirect method with a single or a few regional/country offices in Bangladesh – as part of their broader international organizational system. Donors and even most of the INGOs do not have any direct service system and, therefore, they don't have any service-centre or branch in the community level. However, some of the INGOs have their special administrative and organizational structures based on child protection and development aspects as a central issue but many of them work only on irregular basis and as part of their broader developmental work in this field.

10.2.2 Capacity Building of Different Bodies:

A special type of capacity building including institutional and personnel development of any child labour-related organization is very essential to fight against the vast and complex socio-economic problem of child labour. But, even today, there are wide gaps and also differences among different bodies in this regard. Only the UN bodies and some NGOs have such capacity building facilities and practices to develop the physical and technical expertise to serve better for the working children.

Generally, the **GOB** has a wide scope and necessity to develop its organizational system and manpower but the initiatives and facilities of the GOB in this regard is very inadequate and irregular. It is limited only in the fields of education, public administration, social welfare, etc. In the Government's primary education system, teachers' training is mainly offered by the Primary Teachers' Training Institutes (PTIs) and cluster trainings. Generally these trainings hardly include the special teaching-learning methods for working children groups through a non-formal manner. By the technical help of the ILO-IPEC during 1997, the National Academy for Primary Education (NAPE) introduced a child labour component in its training course, not for the teachers directly but for the district and *thana* level education officers. However, the ultimate objective of this initiative was to equip the primary school teachers to improve the quality of education and to reduce dropout from schools. This programme was completed in July 1998. During 1998-99, the GOB also introduced another child labour-related orientation training for about 300 officials of different ministries by its Public Administration Training Centre (PATC) with the help of the ILO-IPEC (ILO-IPEC, Dhaka, 1999: 7).

Probably, the best initiative of the GOB in terms of capacity building in this specific field was its involvement in the process of the HTR project under DNFE with the help of the UNICEF-Bangladesh.⁷ Teachers of this project were trained with the special teaching methods and other related issues. Both 'basic' and 'refresher' trainings were followed and these trainings included special curriculum, child-centred participatory teaching methods and the special needs and concerns of the hard-to-reach children.⁸ But still, many teachers and supervisors considered the duration of their 'foundation training' (10-12 days) to be inadequate. Even the coordinators felt that provision should be made for an appropriate course of training for them as well (DNFE & UNICEF-Bangladesh, 2000a: xxiii). Till today, there is a lack of training facilities related to working children's education in DNFE's own teachers' training system (DSS, 2001a: 32).

⁷ This project of the GOB has been discussed in Chapter V under Section 5.4.

⁸ Many of these training courses offered by some NGOs have their own non-formal education-based teachers' training centres (e.g. UCEP, BRAC).

Among the **UN Bodies**, on the other hand, the ILO-IPEC is specially good in institutional and capacity building activities on child labour issues as it is one of its major working strategies in Bangladesh.⁹ Since its inception in Bangladesh the IPEC has been playing a very important role in physical capacity building and manpower development of different partner organizations (including GOB departments) to combat child labour. For this purpose, the IPEC works through 'BSAF' – the child rights-related NGOs' apex body in Bangladesh – and upto 1999 about 40 such NGOs were benefited from IPEC's capacity building and institutional developments programme. The personnel of different GOB departments and the BGMEA were also benefited from this programme (ILO-IPEC, Dhaka, 1999: 7). The UNICEF, on the other hand, is also helping the GOB, NGOs and other organizations to built their capacity and expertise and by providing logistic supports for the working children specially in the urban settings through the HTR project and the ex-garment child workers' education i.e., the MOU project.

Among the **NGOs**, many of them developed an army of skilled field workers and managers by their strong capacity building processes. Some NGOs, e.g., AB, BRAC, UCEP, DAM, etc. developed special textbooks and follow-up materials for their own training system. In case of most of the NFE teachers of NGO schools, post-entry training and other periodical trainings were being offered. But still, only a few NGOs have their own self-sufficient and adequate training systems on a regular basis for NFPE, Technical/Vocational skill training, job placement, and other related services for child labour interventions.

In the UCEP, the training of teachers, instructors and support staff is an integral part and ongoing process. It also offers same kind of training for other organizations' staff and teachers, to provide NFE, skill training and other services to the urban working children as it has vast experience and expertise in this regard.

AB accepts that investment in teachers and other staffs through the provision of proper and effective training packages is essential to ensure that they develop knowledge, appropriate skills and commitment (AB, 2001: 41). AB developed its training capacity rapidly. During 1999, its "Training Cell" covered 120

⁹ Institutional development and capacity building activities of ILO-IPEC has been discussed in Chapter VII [under section 7.3.2.c (1)].

participants/staff under 11 courses and in 2000, a total of 557 participants/staff was covered under 13 courses (AB, 2000: 37 & 2001: 1).

Many of the NGOs do not have such facilities but they usually get the help from big NGOs, DNFE and IPEC to develop their manpower. The INGOs, donors and the BGMEA, however, generally do not have such institutional development and capacity building initiatives for themselves or for others, as they are not the direct service providers in this regard.

10.2.3. Supervision and Monitoring:

Supervision and monitoring are very essential to improve the management and quality of the existing child labour programmes. Periodic supervision and monitoring generally “assess progress, identify difficulties, and ascertain problem areas, recommend immediate remedial actions” etc. and they are “primarily concerned with the delivery process in ensuring that inputs, through activities, are transformed into outputs” (Chaturvedi, S. 1994: 106).

In terms of supervision and monitoring, different bodies have different stands. As the **UN bodies, INGOs** and **Donors** do not have direct services for the working children, their supervision and monitoring is not so much important in this regard. Usually they follow their central supervision and monitoring system.

The supervision and monitoring system of the **GOB** in this specific field is not enough and strong. Even in the public education system, for example, it was found in a CAMPE study that, the formal supervision system ensured visits only for 47 per cent of primary schools of the GOB. On the other hand, the **NGO** supervisors visited 79.6 per cent of their non-formal schools. The same study also observed that the mean number of visits by the respective education authority was much higher in the NGO schools than in the formal schools of the GOB (Chowdhury A.M.R.. *et al.* 1999: 10). Though there have been some differences among different NGOs, supervision and monitoring of their programmes are more positive than that of the GOB.

10.2.4. Research and Evaluation:

In terms of child labour research ILO-IPEC is the pioneer and leading organization in Bangladesh. From its inception in Bangladesh, the ILO-IPEC

carried out several research/studies which are the main source of child labour-related data in Bangladesh.¹⁰ The UNICEF-Bangladesh also played an important role by undertaking or supporting various child labour researches for assessing the situations and for evaluation of its sponsored programmes.

In case of the BBS, the national research and statistical authority of the **GOB**, child labour research is comparatively a new phenomenon. Actually, the BBS was involved in child labour research especially by the influence and financial cooperation of the ILO-IPEC during the mid-1990s. The BBS conducted a national sample survey on the child labour problem in 1995-96, which is probably the best work and source of data. After that, BBS involved itself in some other child labour studies e.g., 'hazardous child labour', 'child labour in garment factories', etc. Child labour also became an issue in the GOB's periodic 'Labour Force Survey's during the 1990s. However, the BBS's initiative is not so elaborate and in-depth, as it should be.

The ARISE project of the GOB and the UNDP also emphasized research for an effective and need-based project planning and its implementation. During 1998-99 a series of comprehensive 'Review Study' on "Existing Services Relating to Street Children" in Dhaka city and other 12 big cities including all divisional cities all over the country was undertaken by five different prominent research organizations. In December 1999, five separate study reports were also published based on this review study. These review studies developed an inventory of the existing street children-related services provided by GOs, NGOs and others in the major urban areas of Bangladesh.

Again, based on the recommendations of these review studies, the ARISE project also undertook another important study on street children during 2000-2001. This study report, titled "Baseline Survey of Street Children in Six Divisional Cities of Bangladesh" was published by DSS and UNDP in September 2001. This study estimated the number of street children in the six divisional cities and also studied their actual situation, living environment and other basic needs.

¹⁰ Which have been discussed in details in Chapter VII under Section 7.3.2. (a).

Some leading NGOs developed their own independent research and evaluation system regarding child labour. For example, in the UCEP, research and studies were emphasized during the early 1990s. Most of these researches were carried out by external experts or firms.¹¹

In BRAC, there is a separate “Research and Evaluation Division (RED) and in 1991 it set up a specialized unit for educational research to evaluate the progress of the NFPE department and to study the effectiveness of the BRAC school system (BRAC, 1999: 47). Other big organizations like DAM, Proshika, etc. have their own separate research and evaluation units to evaluate and develop their child labour interventions. Small NGOs, however, hardly have such a research-oriented evaluation process by their own initiatives but sometimes they are covered by the research and evaluation process of their sponsoring big NGOs, donors, INGOs, ILO-IPEC or UNICEF, etc.

10.3. Major Areas of Services and Responses

Different bodies are involved in different types of activities and services for working children to combat the child labour problem. Every type of organization has its own characteristics, aims, and objectives. Their organizational capacity and working strategies are also different. Thus, the area of services and responses of different bodies are different.

Table 10.1 below shows the coverage of services and initiatives of different bodies to combat the child labour problem in Bangladesh during the 1990s. Among them, NGOs were in the best position to perform different activities. Among the 20 major areas of services and responses, the highest number (i.e., 17) of areas was covered by different NGOs. About 100 NGOs throughout the country (more than half of them in the four metro cities) were working with these activities/services for working children. Most of them, however, were working with one or two service areas only. Among these, ‘providing non-formal education’ was the most common. The other common areas were: awareness raising, healthcare, shelter-home services, etc. Most of them were also having a very small geographical coverage with a very

¹¹ See the details in Chapter VIII under Section 8.4.3.

few service centres in one or two city areas.¹² Only a few NGOs were covering most of these 17 service areas or activities as part of their integrated approach. Among them UCEP was the best one and the others were AB, SUROVI, DAM, BRAC, Shaishab-Bangladesh, etc.

Table 10.1: Providing of Services and Initiatives by Different Bodies to Combat Child Labour during the 1990s

Major areas of services and responses	GOB	NGOs	UN Bodies	INGOs	Donors	BGMEA
1. Developing national policy & plan	√					
2. Developing legal provisions	√					
3. Advocacy for promoting policy, planning and legislations and enforcement of it		√	√	√		
4. Child labour research/studies	√	√	√	√		√
5. Capacity building, staff training	√	√	√			
6. Material/curriculum development for NFE and skill training	√	√	√			
7. Providing funds for child labour projects	√		√	√	√	√
8. Awareness raising, motivation, social mobilization against child labour	√	√	√	√		
9. Providing non-formal education	√	√	√			√
10. Providing technical or vocational training	√	√	√			
11. Job-counseling and self-employment		√				√
12. Healthcare & nutritional service	√	√		√		
13. Shelter home/Drop-in-centre	√	√	√			
14. Economic empowerment of family		√	√	√		√
15. Withdrawal of children from hazardous work and placing them into school		√	√			√
16. Safety training and equipment distribution to the children involved in hazardous work		√	√			
17. Research/study on existing child labour interventions		√	√	√	√	
18. Developing integrated approach/model to combat child labour	√	√	√			√
19. Developing network & collaboration against child labour	√	√	√	√	√	√
20. Coordinating child labour interventions		√	√			
Total: 20 Areas	13	17	16	08	03	08

Source: Prepared from information of Chapters V to IX.

¹² See Table 6.2 and Table 6.3 in Chapter VI for details.

The **GOB** had been covering some of the very exclusive fields like developing a national policy, plans and legal provisions, etc. which were at the centre of all other initiatives in this regard. The GOB covered almost 13 out of some 20 major areas— which was not enough on the one hand, and on the other hand, in many areas it was only partially involved (e.g. in case of 5th, 10th, 18th, and 19th component of Table 10.1). Only non-formal education was covered adequately and skill training was covered partially (by ARISE project) by the GOB though there was a wide scope for the GOB to extend and strengthen its interventions to combat child labour seriously.

The **UN bodies**, i.e., UNICEF and ILO were combinedly covering the second largest number (i.e., 16) of fields (Table 10.1). Based on the UN CRC, the UN bodies were involved in advocating for promotion of policy, planning and legislation for working children and to accomplish the same through the government and other organizations. Financial and technical support for action programmes, capacity building and staff training of different partner organizations, research and studies on the matter; awareness raising, etc. were the main areas of interventions of the UN bodies. They were also covering two of the most important action programmes, i.e., non-formal education and skill training – though their involvement was indirect.

The **INGOs** were also covering some important areas (i.e., 8). Among them, policy advocacy, research and study, providing funds to action projects of different organizations, economic empowerment of the related families etc. were the main. Most of them worked through their partner organizations (e.g. NGOs). **Donor countries and organizations**, on the other hand, were playing the key role by providing necessary funds to the GOB departments, NGOs, UN bodies, etc. to combat child labour through different activities and action programmes. To justify their financial assistance and donations, they also evaluated some action programmes through research and study. Both the INGOs and donors were supporting the programme components of other organizations through providing necessary funds.

Among other organizations, **BGMEA** was the prominent one – which was involved in several (08) areas in the process of garment industry's child workers'

educational project which was developed as an inescapable reaction of US Harkin's Bill in the mid 1990s – though basically BGMEA was only a business-sector organization. Therefore, its coverage was very limited in a specific sectors' child labour (garment workers) only and it also worked through the partner NGOs¹³.

10.4. Comparison of Networking and Collaboration

It is a reality that the child labour-related projects e.g. NFE, skill training, etc. run by different bodies were not coordinated sufficiently. Even the GOB-run projects (HTR and ARISE) were not well-coordinated. Some leading NGOs' (e.g. UCEP, AB) own projects were found to be well-coordinated only due to their individual organizational set-up. But the NGO-intervention as a whole (specially the NFE) was not coordinated satisfactorily. For example, in the case of providing NFE, as Professor Shamsul Haque studied, "some NGOs use their own learning materials, others use a combination of theirs and other NGOs' materials, still others use the national curriculum. There is no unity or uniformity in the standard of materials. Besides, most of the materials are oriented to rural setting and urban slum dwellers find no interest in them" (Haque, S. 1996: 45). Lack of coordination with the allied child labour interventions is the main cause of this negative situation. The ARISE project of the GOB was also affected by this weak coordination problem. Therefore, lack of proper coordination is a common problem in case of almost all action programmes of different bodies towards working children. Vide Table 10.2 for a comparative study of this aspect.

The GOB is very successful in coordination and collaboration in the general NFE to achieve the goal of 'Education for All'. However, there are some complexities among several ministries to coordinate these projects. Skill training interventions for working children also could have been well but there was no such initiative in the GOB departments, not even in the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs. Nevertheless, it may be mentioned that the GOB initiatives in this regard were stronger in the tail years of the 1990s.

¹³ The response of the BGMEA in this field has been discussed in Chapter VII (under section 7.6).

Table 10.2: Comparison of Networking and Collaboration of Different Bodies on Education and Skill Training Interventions for Working Children in Bangladesh

Different Bodies	Scope/capacity for networking & collaboration	Status in the 1990s on networking and collaboration	Major limitations on the way of strong networking and collaboration
GOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Widest scope * Huge capacity * Strong organizational set up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Strong in NFE movement but comparatively weak in terms of child labour intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Generally not the direct service provider in this field * Lack of proper commitment * Lack of experienced and competent manpower
Large NGOs (in this field)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Larger scope * Stronger capacity/ regular service provider * Trained & competent manpower & effective organizational set up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Strong/effective network and collaboration * Favorable commitment with technical expertise * Rising trends in networking/collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lack of adequate information
Small NGOs (in this field)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Limited scope * Limited capacity * Having unfavourable organizational set up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Limited networking/collaboration * One way communication as contractors in other's programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lack of proper reporting, management, coordination and effective manpower * Weaker programme implementation * Lack of commitment
UN Bodies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Partnership networking & collaboration as the main strategy/ method * Wider scope (nationally/internationally) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Strong in partnership, networking/collaboration * Positive commitment to intervene in this field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Don't have any direct action programme run by themselves * Only Dhaka-based administrative structure
INGOs & Donors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Limited scope as they are not the direct service provider * Partnership-based working strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Important partner of all related collaborative efforts * Major fund supplier of different bodys' projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lack of strong coordination and monitoring in Bangladesh * Indirect intervention and indirect controlling
BGMEA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Limited Scope * Unfavourable organizational set-up to intervene services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Limited areas and small coverage/fields of cooperation/collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lack of experience & expertise * Lack of proper commitment

Big NGOs like AB, UCEP, BRAC, DAM, etc. are comparatively well in coordinating their own action programmes. They have the favourable commitment, technical expertise and competent manpower to intervene education and/or skill training for working children. With their dynamic working strategy to undertake

new projects or to expand/continue their old projects on education and skill training, emphasis on collaboration, partnership and networking is one of the established and effective techniques. But still, some of them are in a weaker position (e.g. the Surovi) due to the lack of adequate information and effective leadership.

Small NGOs, on the other hand, do not have wide scope and capacity to maintain a strong coordination, collaboration and networking in this regard. Their organizational set-up and service capacity are also not in a favourable position to run all of these. In most cases, they are the respondents of the GOB, UN bodies or big NGOs' collaborative efforts as contract-based limited service providers to the big projects. Therefore, this collaboration is more or less a one-way communication.

Partnership or collaboration is the major key technique to work in this field for the **UN Bodies**, e.g. UNICEF, ILO, etc. The whole country is their target area and generally, the GOB is their working partner. They have the strong organizational capacity to do so. They are committed and internationally experienced also. So, the UN bodies are comparatively in a very good position in networking and collaboration in the field of NFE and skill training interventions for the working children. For example, the ILO develops its IPEC programme to collaborate with governments and other organizations (e.g. NGOs) to build their capacity, to train the personnel, to provide technical and financial help, to undertake effective action projects and research studies in this field for effective child labour interventions all over the world. However, they do not have any direct action programmes like NGOs and do not have any other office except in Dhaka – which are the two important limitations to coordinate their support projects.

The **INGOs and donors**, and other organizations like the **BGMEA** are not direct project interveners, but with their limited scope and capacity, they are playing a very important role to provide NFE and skill training to the working children in urban Bangladesh through partnership, networking and collaboration. They are the main source of funds for these projects. Collaboration is their key strategy to work in this field. However, they have some limitations like inadequate organizational structure, lack of proper controlling of the projects, lack of experience, etc.

10.5. Comparison of Services and Results

10.5.1. The Constraints to Draw a Comparison:

The process of service delivery and the results that were achieved by different bodies are the two major important areas to identify the comparative status of the success of different bodies which are providing educational and skill training interventions for the working children in urban Bangladesh. But, in this field, a good and sensible comparison is very difficult because practically all these bodies are not in a similar position in terms of their area, coverage and involvement periods.

The starting points of their child labour interventions are not the same. A very few (e.g. some large NGOs) started their interventions during the early 1970s to mid-1980s. Some started during the late 1980s to early 1990s. But many of them started in more recent times, i.e., in the middle of the second half of the 1990s (Table 10.3 below). Moreover, the contents of interventions, target groups and coverage, quality of service and sustainability, etc. are also different. Even among the NGOs, there are lots of dissimilarities in terms of their starting time, contents of service, coverage and quality of interventions, etc. (see Table 10.3). Therefore, a clear and comprehensive comparison about their earned result is very hard to measure or quantify.

There are other limitations also implied in this matter. Almost all the direct action projects on education and skill training of different bodies are inter-linked and they collaborated with several other bodies. Some are providing funds, some are providing logistics and technical support, some are responsible for direct implementation of the project, and some are providing training, institutional support, etc. in a single project. Therefore, the success or failure of any project or body cannot be treated as one's own credit or discredit. Lack of adequate data on different bodies' interventions is the other major constraint. Noticing all these limitations, however, the comparison of different bodies will be made through some selected common components and inherent matters that were involved in providing education and skill training intervention for the working children during the period of our study.

Table 10.3: Starting Periods of Different Bodies' Child Labour Intervention in Bangladesh

Child Labour Interventions and Related Activities	GOB	UCEP	Selected Other Big NGOs	Small NGOs	UN Bodies, INGOs & Donors	BGMEA
1. Advocacy & awareness raising	Early 1990s	Late 1970s	Late 1980s	Early 1990s	1 st half of 1990s	Middle of the 1990s
2. National policy and planning	1 st half of 1990s	---	---	---	---	---
3. Child labour-related legislations	1 st half of 1990s	---	---	---	---	---
4. Non-formal education	1 st half of 1990s	Early 1970s	One in late 1970s & mostly in early 1990s	1 st half to middle of 1990s	Middle of 1990s	2 nd half of 1990s
5. Pre-vocational skill training	2 nd half of 1990s	Mid-1990s	Early 80s & early 90s	Mid-1990s	Late 1990s	---
6. Vocational skill training	---	2 nd half of 1970s	---	---	---	---
7. Drop-in centre, shelter-home, open-air street school	Late 1990s	---	Middle of 1990s	2 nd half of 1990s	2 nd half of 1990s	---
8. Job-placement support	End of 1990s	Early 1990s	Late 1990s	---	---	End of 1990s
9. On-the-job-training facilities	---	1 st half of 1990s	---	---	---	Late 1990s
10. Family support programme	---	---	Middle of 1990s	---	2 nd half of 1990s	Late 1990s
11. Curriculum development for NFE	2 nd half of 1990s	Late 1980s	Middle of 1990s	---	Middle of 1990s	---
12. Manpower development	2 nd half of 1990s	Late 1980s	1 st half of 1990s	---	Middle of 1990s	---
13. Combination of NFE and skill training interventions	Late 1990s (Partially)	Late 1970s	Late 1980s to middle of 1990s	2 nd half of 1990s	Late 1990s	Late 1990s
14. Stipend with schooling	---	2 nd half of 1990s*	---	---	2 nd half of 1990s	2 nd half of 1990s
15. Research and studies	1 st half of 1990s	Late 1980s	2 nd half of 1980s	---	Early 1990s	Mid-1990s
16. Institutional development & strategic/logistic support	---	1 st half of 1990s	Late 1990s	---	2 nd half of 1990s Mid-1980s (for INGOs & Donors)	---
17. Fund supply/ resource mobilization	Middle of 1990s	---	---	---	2 nd half of 1990s Mid-1980s (for INGOs & Donors)	2 nd half of 1980s

* Only for the technical schools and para-trade training centres' students @ TK. 200 per month.

Source: As cited in Chapters V-IX under relevant Sections.

10.5.2: Comparison of Non-Formal Educational Interventions:

Non-formal education (NFE) is comparatively the common intervention to combat the child labour problem among different bodies. Though NGOs are the only direct service providers in case of NFE, many others like the GOB, UN bodies, INGOs and Donors, and BGMEA are also deeply involved in this process. Only some big NGOs started their NFE programme during 1970s to early 1980s but all other parties were involved in it mostly in the 1990s (Table 10.3).

i) The Depth in Educational Interventions: Many of the projects designed for working children are very simplistic and inadequate in the coverage of grades in the NFE learning centres. The GOB-run HTR project has a provision of NFE only upto grade III but the ARISE project, on the other hand, does not have any fixed limit to provide NFE. Some partner NGOs of the ARISE follow upto grade I, some follow upto II while others follow upto III. Some larger NGOs, who have their own NFE programmes for working children, also cover upto grade II (e.g. ASK). Without a well-coordinated continuing educational facilities, these types of short-termed NFE only upto grade II or III are not adequate enough to bring any positive change in the underprivileged life of the working children. This may be helpful in terms of the so-called literacy movement but this may not be treated as a breakthrough in their life. Only some larger NGOs, e.g. Surovi, Proshika, etc. are providing NFE for this group covering upto grade V or VIII. The UCEP is also covering upto grade VIII in their general education system (Table 10.4). This is much better than all other programmes with very small coverage.

Therefore, in terms of depth in NFE intervention, initiatives of many projects or bodies are not so effective. In the MOU project, however, the major limitation is that, the children who cross the age limit of 14, do not remain the target of the MOU project. So this project is not responsible for their education any more. Depth is, therefore, neglected in this project also.

ii) Teaching Method and School Environment: There is a lot of difference in teaching method and other issues of school environment followed by different bodies in their educational projects. Generally, all the educational projects follow comparatively a good manageable number of students, i.e., 25 to 30 in each grade. Therefore, the teacher-student ratio is also most satisfactory, i.e. 1:25 or 1:30

Table 10.4: Comparison of NFE Interventions of Different Bodies by the End of the 1990s

NFE projects of different bodies	NFE covered upto grade	Students in each grade/ group	Teacher-student & male-female ratio	Duration & School days in each grade	Daily school hours	Attendance & drop out rates	Curriculum followed	Follow-up & home visits	Rate of success in exams
HTR project of GOB and UNICEF	III	30 (average)	1 : 30 & 45 : 55	08 months & 200 days	02 hours	52% & 23.5%	Specially developed by DNFE	Very little	54%
ARISE Project of GOB and UNDP	Not fixed (I, II or III)	25 – 30	1 : 25/30 & 65 : 35	6 to 9 months & 135-200 days	02 to 03 hours	85% & not available	No fixed curriculum	Very little	Not available
MOU Project of UNICEF, ILO and BGMEA	Not fixed	20-25	1 : 20/25 & 20 : 80	1 year & 270 days	03 hours	About 25% & not available	NCTB + own developed	Partial	Not available
Larger NGOs' own Projects *	II to VIII	30 (average)	1 : 30 & 43 : 27	6 to 9 months 1 year & 135-270 days	02 to 03 hours	90% - 95% & 4% - 5%	NCTB + own developed	Partial	80 to 95%
UCEP's GE Programme	VIII	30	1 : 30 & 49 : 51	6 months & 135 days	2½ hours	More than 95% & less than 4%	NCTB + own developed	Followed- by trained personnel	More than 97%

* AB, BRAC, SUROVI, Shoishab-Bangladesh, Proshika, etc.

(Table 10.4). In government schools, which are the most dominant type in primary education, as CAMPE study found, there were 73 students per teacher in 1999 (Chowdhury, A.M.R. *et al.* 1999). To provide NFE, almost all the bodies follow centre-based NFE system. Some projects, e.g. ARISE follow both centre-based (but more informal) and mobile/open air street school system mainly for street-based working children.

The MOU project follows almost the public school system, that is 1 year duration, in each grade and 3 hours in each day. By this it covers about 270 school days in a single grade. Larger NGOs in this field follow different systems: 6 months (AB, Shoishab) to 9 months (Proshika, SEEP, etc.) duration in each grade. But others follow 1 year duration (e.g. BRAC, GSS, etc.). Daily school time is also different: 3 hours (in AB), 2.5 hours (in BRAC, Surovi, etc.) and even 2 hours (e.g. in Shoishab). Therefore, the total school days in each grade is also different: from 135 to 270 days approximately. The UCEP NFE, however, strictly follows 6 months course duration, 2.5 hour school time and 135 school days in a session (Table 10.4). These differences in schooling system naturally affect the results and achievements of NFE intervention.¹⁴

iii) Male-Female Ratio, Attendance and Dropout Rates among the Students: Now-a-days, NFE among the urban underprivileged children is fully female dominated. Girls cover 80 per cent in the MOU project (because the lion's share of the sacked-out endangered garment workers were girls), 57 per cent in larger NGOs, 55 per cent in the HTR project and 51 per cent in the UCEP generated education. The only exception is the ARISE project where girls cover 35 per cent only (Table 10.4), because boys are dominant in the street children group. However, this overall female dominance is a good sign in terms of achieving gender equity among the urban underprivileged poor children.

The rate of attendance in different bodies' interventions is different. In the HTR project it was found to be 52 per cent by the Formative Evaluation Team of HTR. According to their comment, "since the contact period was only 2 hours a day, a low attendance rate must be a source of concern to the teacher" (DNFE &

¹⁴ According to UNICEF (1995), in the formal primary schools of GOB, children of grades I & II get only about two hours per day for classroom works, while in grades III-V, it is 3.25 hours per day (cited by Ehsan, M.A. 1998: 321).

UNICEF Bangladesh, 2000a: 5-1). This rate was found to be comparatively better in the ARISE project where the average attendance rate was 85 per cent approximately. In this field the larger NGOs (90% to 94%) and the UCEP (more than 95%) were specially in a very good position. It may be noted that the same rate in formal primary schools of the Government was only 50 in 1996-97 (Ehsan, M.A.1998: 321) and it rose to 62 per cent in 1999 (Choudhury, A.M.R. *et al.* 1999:5). The higher attendance rate must have effects on higher rate of success of students and other positive results of non-formal education.

Larger NGOs and the UCEP are also in a very satisfactory position in terms of students' dropout rate which is only 4 to 5 per cent in larger NGOs and even less than 4 per cent in the UCEP. In the MOU Project, as many researchers observed, it seems to be very high, even up to 25 per cent. As UNICEF observed, there were age dropouts meaning that they came to school when they were close to fourteen years at the time of enrolment and after a few months left the schools to join the factories or other work. Majority of the dropouts in MOU schools resulted from this segment. Learning dropouts were much less, generally below 25 per cent (UNICEF-Bangladesh, 1998) – but still very high compared to other NFE schools. The dropout rate, however, in ARISE project is not available. In HTR project, this rate is comparatively very high – i.e., 23.5 per cent or even more (Table 10.4).¹⁵ Weak school environment and NFE system as well as inexperienced teachers are the major causes of high dropout which resulted in the low level of positive impact of the GOB projects.

iv) Curriculum, Follow-up and Home Visit, and Social Work Support Service: In terms of curriculum, there is not a big gap among different bodies' NFE system. Generally, schools in Bangladesh operate on a very traditional curriculum - much of the learning is by rote, and children rapidly lose their interest (Stalker, P. 1997: 17). In the field of providing NFE, the need of a need-based, user-friendly curriculum is ratified by almost all of those bodies involved here. With the help of NCTB and some NGOs, DNFE developed a moderate curriculum and primers for the HTR project (DNFE Project-3). But in ARISE, there is no fixed

¹⁵ In formal primary schools, on an average, the dropout rate was 4 to 7 per cent in 1999 (Chowdhury, A.M.R. *et al.* 1999: 5).

curriculum or primers for street children. Some NGOs follow their own curriculum, some follow HTR curriculum, and some others follow BRAC curriculum, etc. BRAC and GSS, the two NGOs who run the education programme in the MOU project, follow their own curriculum. Larger NGOs including those two, follow both the NCTB and their own developed need-based curriculum (Table 10.4). In the UCEP, “curriculum is life-oriented, need-based and professional in nature aiming to prepare students to match the demands of the job market” (DPC, 1996: 36).

As we discussed earlier, follow-up, home-visit and other social work supports (e.g. counselling, negotiation, as well as motivation in the family, community and work-place, etc.) are strategically very important to achieve the real success in any type of child labour intervention like NFE. In UCEP, it is an integral part of the combined educational intervention and teachers of general schools are well trained and provided ‘TA’ to do so strictly. Some larger NGOs who have their own NFE programme partly follow this system (e.g. in AB, BRAC, Shoishab) but this is not to be an integral part of their NFE model nor the teachers/staff are being provided with adequate training and financial assistance for this. Two of the GOB projects (HTR and ARISE) ideologically believe that follow-up and home-visits are necessary to achieve the goals of these projects¹⁶ but operationally they follow this very little (Table 10.4). There is no emphasis on this, nor is there the facilities of training and financial assistance in this matter.

v) Participation of the Family, Community and Employers in the School System: Participation of families, community and the employers in the school system is strategically the other important matter. But in this matter, there is a gulf of difference between different bodies’ projects. Both of the GOB projects did not maintain this adequately. For example, there is a general impression that the ‘Centre Management Committees (CMCs) have not been particularly effective in supporting the NFE-3 (HTR) project (DNFE & UNICEF-Bangladesh, 2000a: 7-7). Therefore, the attendance rate of these projects was found to be low, and the

¹⁶ For example, in HTR project document, there was a provision for home visit. According to the Formative Evaluation on HTR Projects, “in addition to classroom teaching, the teachers are to visit the homes of the pupils to monitor their progress and to communicate with their families”.

dropout rate was very high. Some of the larger NGOs have followed it strictly (e.g. in AB, BRAC, Shoishab) and some were yet to follow. However, all larger NGOs are in a process to develop stronger participation of related families, communities and the employers of working children. In the UCEP, on the other hand, parents, local self-government authorities, slum leaders, employers, etc. are being encouraged to participate in its programmes very successfully. This resulted in a very good acceptance of the UCEP programmes in the community, high attendance and low dropout rates and a well-managed school environment in the UCEP NFE system.

vi) Academic Success of Students and Prospect of Higher Education:

All those factors discussed earlier impacted on the academic success of students in different projects. According to the mid-term evaluation of the HTR project, about 54 per cent of the learners became successful in their academic examinations. Larger NGOs' own NFE programmes achieved comparatively very good results: their students became successful by 80 to 95 per cent in their academic tests. This can be easily explained by their good school environment, proper NFE approach, etc. In the UCEP, more than 97 per cent of the students became successful in their regular examinations and tests.¹⁷

vii) Educational Qualifications of Teachers and the Salary Structure:

Educational qualifications of teachers and the salary that they enjoy are the two other important influential factors affecting the quality and other achievements in non-formal educational intervention. In this matter, different bodies are in different positions. Naturally, a well-qualified teacher who gets a satisfactory level of salary may ensure a better quality education and better achievement regarding the whole project goal. In the GOB projects and most of the NGOs' programmes, these two matters are generally neglected. In the HTR project, it was found that, about 39 per cent of the teachers were below the HSC¹⁸ level. Other 39 per cent had the HSC level qualification. Only 25 per cent had the bachelor's degree (DNFE & UNICEF-Bangladesh, 2000a: 3-5). Again, about 25 per cent of HTR teachers were students (op.

¹⁷ On the contrary, in formal primary schools, the average completion rate was 72.7 per cent in 1999 (Chowdhury, A.M.R. *et al.* 1999: 5).

¹⁸ HSC: Higher Secondary School Certificate.

cit.: 3-17). These teachers enjoyed a monthly salary of only 800 taka for their main duty hours i.e. 2 hours. Teachers' involvement in the whole process was very low and furthermore, "24% of the teachers were found to be serving in 2 or more learning centres" (op. cit.: 4-2). This condition, of course, was not helpful for good achievements in the HTR project operation.

Teachers of ARISE project and in NGO-run NFE schools were not much more different from those in the HTR schools. DPC studied this phenomenon in 1996 and found that, in general, in the NGOs' (e.g. BACE, BRAC, DAM, JC, Shoishab, Surovi, etc.) NFE programmes, qualifications of the majority of teachers were SSC¹⁹ and below SSC while some were HSC and these teachers were also entitled to receive only a "minimum salary". Therefore, their performance was found to be relatively poor... (DPC, 1996: 36-37). On the other hand, in the UCEP, "although the minimum qualification is HSC, most of the teachers are graduates and even post-graduates". Moreover, the salary of this organization's teachers was good, and commensurate with their responsibilities (DPC, 1996: 37). These teachers were also facilitated by quality service-oriented trainings and thus became well-motivated and competent.

viii) Comparison of Cost per Student in Non-Formal Education: The least but not the least issue of comparison is the cost per student. There is a huge data gap on this issue. In HTR Project, however, the allocated per student cost for each grade was Tk. 615.33 (AUCC, PAL & DPC Group, 2001: 91). But the actual cost finally increased to Tk. 617.57 as found by the formative evaluation team (DNFE & UNICEF-Bangladesh, 2000a: 1-17). Similar data are not available for the ARISE Project.

In case of NGO interventions, as Table 10.5 shows, during the mid-1990s, the average cost per student of some major NGOs who had child labour programmes e.g. BACE, BRAC, DAM, GSS, UCEP, etc. was Tk. 483.31 (including UCEP) and Tk. 460.36 excluding UCEP. The lowest cost was in BACE (Tk. 371.1) with a provision of NFE upto grade-III and the highest cost was in the UCEP (Tk. 644.0) with a provision of NFE upto grade VII during the mid-1990s. Surovi and DAM – the two other major NGOs in this field – also had comparatively higher

¹⁹ SSC: Secondary School Certificate.

costs, i.e. Tk. 594.7 (with a coverage upto grades I to V) and Tk. 580.2 (with a coverage upto grade I-III). These rates, however, were not so high in comparison with the Govt. primary schools which cover I-V grades. In 1993-94 per student expenditure in Government schools was Tk. 1,923 (Tk. 580 for revenue and Tk. 1,343 for development expenditure) [DPC, 1996: 43].

Table 10.5: Comparative Cost per Student in NFE of Different NGOs during the Mid-1990s

Selected NGOs who have NFE programme for the urban underprivileged groups	Grade covered	Cost per student per academic grade (Taka)
Bangladesh Association for Community Education (BACE)	3 (I-III)	373.1
Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC)	1 (II)	539.3
Dhaka Ahasania Mission (DAM)	3 (I-III)	580.2
Gana Shahjja Sangstha (GSS)	3 (I-III)	424.9
Jagarani Chakra (JC)	2 (I-II)	495.7
Shaw Unnayan (SU)	3 (I-III)	424.9
Surovi (SUR)	5 (I-V)	594.7
Underprivileged Children Education Programme (UCEP)	7 (1P-BCP2)	644.0
All NGOs including UCEP	---	483.31
All NGOs excluding UCEP	---	460.36

Source: DPC, 1996; *Study on Comparative Evaluation of Implementation and Performance of UCEP, Govt. Primary and Selected NGO Educational Programmes*, p. 41 (precised from Table 8.2).

In the UCEP, the cost was comparatively high. Per student per day cost was found to be Tk. 7.31 in 1998-99 and Tk 7.88 in 1999-2000 for its general education. However, this higher rate of expenditure is totally justified with the consideration of its integrated approach, quality of teachers and quality education, yearly net outputs of more than 26,000 graduates, high attendance rate, low dropout rate, yearly man-days covered in teachers training, intensive and frequent contacts between the students and their families, constant back-home follow-ups of students by teachers, intensive social works, and community meetings for enhanced community participation, etc. (DPC, 1996:43).

10.5.3. Comparison of Skill Training Interventions:

As we discussed earlier, there is no other direct service provider except the NGOs in skill training intervention. The number of NGOs which are engaged in this field is very limited in comparison to those in NFE services. Some NGOs have their own skill training programmes and some are providing this as part of the

ARISE project, MOU project, or as part of the IPEC action project of ILO. However, there is a lot of differences among these skill training programmes in terms of quality training centres with adequate equipments, trained instructors, etc; adequate need-based trades; number of seats in each trade in a single batch; yearly coverage in skill training intervention; job-opportunity of skill-trained graduates; etc.

Again, except UCEP's vocational training school (VTs) [3 each in Dhaka, Chittagong and Khulna] intervention, there is no other well-equipped quality vocational training facility designed for urban underprivileged working children. In 3 VTs, there are 24 trades (16 for boys and 8 for girls) under 13 different units. The duration of different courses is from 6 months (e.g. in garments) to 2 years (e.g. in automobiles) [see Table 8.2 in Chapter VIII]. This vocational training programme also has been accredited by the Bangladesh Technical Education Board which allows the UCEP graduates to take part in the examination conducted by the Board (Mia, A. 1998b: 40).²⁰

There are 13 other NGOs except some newcomers in this field under the ARISE project who have semi-skilled training courses for working children.²¹ The common characteristics as well as limitations of their programmes except a very few e.g. AB, Surovi, etc. are as follows:

- Very irregular services;
- Skill training component designed only as a part of another project;
- Very limited trade courses, e.g. 2 to 5 trades;
- Very traditional trade courses, e.g. tailoring, sewing, embroidery;
- Very small coverage in each batch, e.g. 20 to 30;
- Training programmes not well-accommodated with the administrative set-up;
- Don't have adequate, permanent and well-trained training instructors;
- Lack of an integrated approach of skill training and job-placement support;
- Most of them work only in Dhaka city; and so on.

UCEP has overcome almost all these limitations. It has a wider coverage comparatively e.g. 1461 students in VTs and 579 in PTTCs in each year (e.g. in 1999-2000), 96 per cent and above attendance rate, only 3 and one per cent dropout

²⁰ The skill training intervention of the UCEP has been discussed in Chapter VIII (under Sections 8.3.2 and 8.3.3) and the outstanding impact of it has been discussed in Chapter IX (under Section 9.4).

²¹ Discussed in Chapter V under Section 5.5.3 (ii) and Chapter VI under Section 6.5.

rate in VTSs and PTTCs respectively. A total of 1864 graduates came out from UCEP VTSs and PTTCs (as in 1999-2000) (UCEP-Bangladesh, 2000:23 & 29). As Syed and associates found in their study in 1998, an overwhelming 98.43 per cent of technical graduates of UCEP were employed (1998:53 & 85).

The other two important service providers of technical education are AB and Surovi which are working only in Dhaka city as part of their regular programme. They are providing short-term (6 months in Surovi) to midterm (1 year in AB) skill training programmes in different trades. AB is comparatively a more forward and well-organized organization in terms of skill training intervention. It has 6/7 trades e.g. tailoring, embroidery, greetings card making, pickles processing etc. and covers comparatively a large number of working/street children. As of 2000, a total of 562 students was enrolled in AB's skill training programmes. But in Surovi, there are only 2 courses: doll making and tailoring covering a smaller number: 150 per session. The training equipments and facilities are not adequate in both these two NGOs. In AB, almost all the trainers are appointed as part-time workers. The job placement facilities are not so strong in both of these two NGOs in comparison to UCEP.

Under the MOU project, there is a provision of skill training and AB, Surovi and UCEP are responsible to provide short-term skill training to MOU and HTR graduates. There is no extra facility for them except the regular training facilities in those NGOs. In the UCEP, MOU students get training for 6 months in garments, wool knitting, tailoring, etc. and there are also 1-year courses in carpentry, automobile work, and auto electricity as well (UCEP-Bangladesh, 1998).

Therefore, apart from the above differences, in terms of coverage of cities and number of working children, UCEP was a unique one. UCEP covered all the four metro cities. More than 4000 working children had been receiving skill training from different NGOs and among them, UCEP alone covered more than half during each year by the end of the decade 1990s. We have already seen that UCEP was also unique among the NGOs in providing NFE and skill-training to the underprivileged urban working children. Hence, the GOB as well as other bodies should emulate the fine example of UCEP more widely for the eradication of the evil of child labour from the soil of Bangladesh.